

**Channel Islands Marine Sanctuary  
Marine Reserves Working Group Meeting**

September 27, 2000  
8:30a.m.-5:00 p.m.  
Veteran s Hall  
Santa Barbara, California

**Draft Meeting Summary**

---

**In Attendance:**

Patty Wolf, Co-Chair	Matt Pickett, Co-Chair	Locky Brown
Marla Daily	Gary Davis	Robert Fletcher
Dr. Craig Fusaro	Dale Glantz	Neil Guglielmo
Greg Helms	Mark Helvey	Deborah McArdle
Dr. Michael McGinnis	Chris Miller	Tom Raftican
Steve Roberson	Alicia Stratton	

Michael Eng, Facilitator      John Jostes, Facilitator

Staff from CINMS/NOAA: Dr. Satie Airame, Sean Hastings, Ben Waltenberger, Coastal Service Center and Special Projects Staff

**Introduction** (Patty Wolf and Matt Pickett, MRWG co-chairs)

Patty Wolf and Matt Pickett opened the meeting, and emphasized that the mapping effort today was a starting point and no firm decisions were being made. Matt asked the group to draw upon the data in the decision support tool and the Coastal Services Center and Special Projects staff to assist in the mapping exercise.

John Jostes, lead facilitator, added that the MRWG have good tools and personal knowledge to shape the mapping process, and with this information and creativity they can work to bring the group closer together. He also emphasized the importance to take today s work and share it with their constituents.

Michael Eng, co-facilitator, asked the group to explore many alternatives in the mapping process; this will help determine where there is common ground and where there are differences to aid future discussion. He then detailed the mapping exercise, describing how the MRWG would work in small mixed groups (4 to 5 people, representing a cross spectrum of interest) to increase creativity, and to challenge each other to work together.

Michael McGinnis expressed concern over Mark Helvey s (NMFS representative) emphasis on fisheries issues over biodiversity issues. McGinnis offered a conceptual framework on what he sees coming to play in this process, this framework includes: incorporating the Sanctuary s mandate for ecosystem protection; the public s general support for biodiversity and ecosystem protection; and integrating local user knowledge

and maps. He added that an agency's mandate is not negotiable and historically, the courts have determined that Federal and State agencies are responsible to uphold their mandates in negotiated processes.

Tom Ratifican added that socio economic considerations are also part of the agency mandates.

Mark Helvey clarified that his fisheries related comments are based on the rebuilding strategies for particular species (rockfish) that need help, and the State's effort to stem over fishing. He wants to keep these issues in focus in the reserve process.

### **Agenda Overview /Feedback from Previous day Sept. 26, 2000 meeting (John Jostes)**

Each member of the MRWG offered feedback on their impressions and understanding of the Science and Socio-Economic Panels presentations from the previous day. Most members said that the Science Panel recommendation and amount of data presented was overwhelming, unanticipated and that it will take some time to fully understand the data and advice. Several members expressed gratitude to the Science Panel, adding that the Panel had done the job the MRWG requested by providing valuable advice and helping to prepare the MRWG for mapping.

There were concerns over the completeness of the Socio-economic information. The group was reminded that the process is based on the best available information, which included substantial investment and time in collecting new social and economic information (i.e. anecdotal data, refined fisheries information, etc.).

Mark Helvey — Looking forward to overlaying science and socioeconomics, feels prepared to start mapping.

Locky Brown - The magnitude of the Science Panel recommendation for 30-50% closures was stunning and until he understands their advice fully he does not feel prepared for mapping.

Gary Davis - Began with a quote, Luck is preparation meeting opportunity. He feels the Science Panel did an incredible job, and can appreciate how the advice might be overwhelming. He too wishes there were better socioeconomic data. He believes the MRWG is lucky to have the information and tools to work with, is thus well prepared and has the opportunity to shape meaningful reserves.

Tom Raftican - Overwhelmed and uncertain about the Science Panel presentation yesterday, he was expecting them to show MWRG best habitat and biodiversity areas. He does not feel schooled enough to ask the right questions. Noted that the George's Bank reserve example is a very different area, and contends that the 30-50% recommended closures are extreme. He wants to overlay socioeconomic information on the Science Panel advice.

Deborah McArdle — Given her background with this issue, she was still overloaded with the Science Panel data, and she empathizes with the rest of the group. However, she believes the MRWG received the best available data and needs to go forward with this information.

Michael McGinnis — This year marks the CINMS 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary, and finally marine ecosystem science came forward yesterday. Stated that the Sanctuaries Act was and is a very progressive act, ahead of its time in 1972. He asked rhetorically: what does biodiversity mean and how do we deal with it? He noticed that several MRWG members were not happy with the Science Panel recommendation, now the issue is how the group deals with what is to some member s unfavorable information. He remarked that the Sanctuaries mandate of compatible use does not necessarily mean the protection and use are weighted equally.

Neil Guglielmo - Recognized all of the hard work that went into the socioeconomic data collection and is amazed at how much work the Science Panel has done. He has a different perspective as a grandfather now, such that 30-50% closures seem like a good deal looking 15 years in the future. However, today as a representative of a thousand squid fishermen he believes there will be tremendous economic pain from such closures. He stated that the squid industry can not live with the Science Panel recommendation, but they would be favorable to smaller reserves. He holds that what is needed are tighter regulatory controls and quotes. He requested the assistance of fishing community members in mapping potential reserve areas. He added that it would be important to proceed with implementation of reserves slowly over time. He recognizes that small reserves may not be as ecologically beneficial but economic impacts need to be considered.

Steve Roberson — Impressed and amazed by the Science Panel s unanimous opinion. He is concerned about a 50% closure and still having sport fishing. He is excited to finally start mapping potential areas, and feels it is the right time to deal with this part of the process. He can appreciate Neil's concerns, and is seeking a proposal the whole group can live with.

Matt Pickett — Believes the MRWG is extremely fortunate to have all of the data at their fingertips. He noted that other State and Federal reserve processes would likely not have this level of detail in the information/data. The Science Panel s recommendation supports the Sanctuary s ecosystem mandate.

Patty Wolf — The MRWG does have more information to work with than other reserve processes. She too was surprised by the Science Panel results and needs time to fully grasp their recommendation. The Science Panel has been terrific, even though the proposed range of closures is larger than we started with (20% within 1 mile of the Islands) and larger than what was expected. The Science Panel recommendation is conceptually strong and well grounded in literature and theory. The process is right on track.

Marla Daily — Echoed Patty's comments and believe the MRWG is on track. Recognizes that we are under a microscope of other processes. She wants to appropriately weight socioeconomic data and is excited about the anecdotal information. She is looking forward to layering information on the mapping exercise.

Chris Miller - Pleased with the Science Panel's willingness to interact with fisherman and holds that this will make the process more open. The Science Panel recommendation cleared up how this process integrates with fishery management, and has given us a framework to build on. This was something he didn't fully understand, likely due to earlier time commitments constraining his dedication time to the process.

Craig Fusaro — [Handed out Santa Barbara News Press article on yesterday meeting] Stated that the Science and Socio-economic panels advice was an important step in the process. He is disappointed in the lack of depth in the socioeconomic data and has several questions left unanswered. He is impressed and pleased with the Science Panel work, noting that they delivered what the group asked them to. He pointed out that is not the Science Panel's job to wrestle with location now, that is the MRWG job. To map size effectively he believes the group needs to keep their minds open and be creative over the next few months. He pointed out a recent MPA news article that discusses the reopening of the George's Bank closed areas. In CINMS he hopes that kelp forest monitoring sites will be incorporated inside and outside of reserves given their value as a long-term data set. Craig noted that the Science Panel felt stifled by MRWG presence at their meetings and he will not attend future meetings; he recommends the rest of the group do the same and not attend their meetings. He believes that the MRWG inhibits the necessary give and take and free interplay that the Science Panel needs.

Greg Helms - Struck by strength and unanimous Science Panel recommendation. In other science-based recommendations there is usually caution and hesitation, and yet the Panel delivered what we requested of them. He feels pressure to honor his constituency, and from the precedent being set by this process. There are critical questions and challenges ahead: what does it mean to use science to accomplish our biodiversity and basic fish goals and minimize socioeconomic impacts? And how to address the challenges of merging shared local knowledge and objective science? He stated that we do have to uphold the agencies mandates, and the MRWG goals seem compatible.

Bob Fletcher — Did not take the Science panel recommendation favorably, it was not what he expected from them. He is concerned about how the recreational industry will react given their negative reaction to earlier proposed closures of 20%. For ground fish, it is important to understand what is going on outside of the CINMS region, e.g. the PFMC policy to reduce up to 50% or more of the fleet. The species found in the CINMS go well beyond the six-mile sanctuary boundary. Also, the PFMC policy to reduce open access fisheries must be considered. Fishermen can't survive at these levels. Additional regulations being considered or in effect that are hammering fishermen include: the Cowcod and other rock fish closures, which will take 90 years to rebuild; the Canary Rockfish plan North of Point conception (which will affect shrimpers too); two month closure on recreational fishery in January and February; reduction in the bag limits; and

other emergency closures. He will consider habitat and ecosystem protection in light of all the other processes. Going forward with 30-50% closures is not realistic. If we take away half of CINMS waters we've put fishermen out of business.

Dave Glantz - Appreciates Science Panel's hard work, but after their presentation reminded him of his worst fears. Fear of the kelp industry not being considered in the recommendation. Kelp is very different industry and fishery, and the fishery models applied in the Science Panel Recommendation do not fit well with kelp harvest. There are not long-term benefits for every fishery. He has provided decades worth of information and monitoring. The Science Panel proposal would knock the kelp industry out of business.

### **Socioeconomic Data Discussion**

Peter Wiley, NOAA economist, elaborated on the aggregate socio-economic layer (see handout) as being composed of several layers that have different units of measurement, thus the aggregate layer is not meant to represent a particular use, it is simply a proxy of aggregate use in CINMS.

Only consumption activities would be considered displaced by reserves, non-consumptive uses are not displaced so no negative impacts are expected. The Socio-economic data does not provide information on expected benefits of reserves placement. Besides kelp and squid, the Fishing Data Review Committee did not provide fishery by fishery data, and chose to aggregate all fisheries, individual fisheries data is thus constrained and the aggregate layer loses resolution. Squid fishermen also provided maps for wet fish (mackerel, sardines, and anchovies) fishing areas and values. When assessing reserve boundary impacts all costs and benefits are factored and detailed profiles will be presented to the MRWG on these values.

Gary Davis — Is it more accurate to view this data as more social than economic?

Bob Leeworthy — The aggregate fishing layer map does mix apples and oranges, it serves more as an index of uses.

Peter Wiley — The actual values are not in the aggregate data layer, the values had to be normalized. However, during the impact analysis stage, individual fishery impacts will be assessed.

Mike Eng — What do the darkest areas mean on the aggregate map?

Peter Wiley — These normalized areas are a proxy for highest use, but remember this is a limited analysis to date.

Ben Waltenberger — The Decision Support Tool can pull up individual fishery maps, remember purse seines and kelp are excluded from the fishery data layer, and there is no

data provided for the prawn and shrimp fisheries. One can look to exclusion area maps and the anecdotal report for prawns and shrimping areas.

Peter Wiley- Person days translate to revenue, income, and employment (jobs).

A spreadsheet on how person days are converted will be provided.

Bob Fletcher — Layering science panel and socio-economic data layers is good, but collective knowledge of MRWG must come into play too.

### **Decision Support Tool Overview**

Ben Waltenberger gave an overview of the Spatial Support and Analysis Tool or the Decision Support Tool (please refer to Draft Technical manual dated 8/14/00). He recognized the tremendous work and effort from NOAA's Special Projects and Coastal Services Center Staff. The Decision Support Tool is a geographic information system (GIS) based tool that offers visualization and data imaging of multiple spatial and attributes layers of information including local ecology, characteristics and socioeconomic impacts of user created reserve designs.

Ben reviewed some of the information and display capabilities of the tool. He pointed out several attributes of the decision support tool, including: the ability to weight MRWG goals differently; how to map areas with line polygons; how to mine data information imbedded in the selected areas; and sources and descriptions of the available data (i.e. recreational use is measured by number of person days, science panel information includes biological zones and fishery exclusion zones, anecdotal data from local users and revenue from squid and kelp). Each MRWG breakout group will have support from a NOAA technical person to assist in utilizing the Decision Support Tool.

Neil Guglielmo — pointed out that to date there has been poor reporting of revenue and landings by squid fishermen and buyers, so the data in the tool is not complete.

### **Weighting Goals and Objectives**

Michael Eng offered an exercise to weight the MRWG goals and objectives. He believes weighting the goals should help the MRWG focus on spatial and design aspects, delineate group priorities, and create a common starting point for mapping reserve areas. Once the mapping exercise is underway the breakout group can test other weighting profiles. A weighting exercise is a way to see what people learned moving into option development to accommodate each other's interests.

MRWG members raised several questions and concerns about the weighting exercise, including:

There are only two data layers to weight.

Weighting preferences will change depending on which area of the Sanctuary is being considered.

Why should all breakout groups start with the same weighting if they will change anyway?

The Science Panel said there may be a way to bring the ecological and social/economic data layers together — weighting is not working toward this common goal.

It will be difficult to find a common weighting among the group.

Commercial users have already drawn lines based on their fishing areas.

We should integrate goals and objectives, not segregate by weighting.

Ben Waltenberger offered that the decision support tool is flexible and the breakout groups can adjust the relative value of ecological and economic goals as they see fit. For example, one can utilize the Decision Support Tool to try various weightings, e.g. 90/10, 80/20, 70/30. Or, each group could start with three weighting profile 50/50, 75/25 and 25/75? Practically, a weighting profile of 50% for the biodiversity goal and 50% socio-economic goal is relatively of equal value, the darker color gradations on the map will show areas where there are good data and the relative maximized value for either or both biodiversity and socio-economics. Above all else, don't rely on the computer to answer all the questions, each MRWG member must draw on their own expertise and knowledge.

Michael Eng - Echoed that MRWG members should use more than just the data layers in the decision support tool, and draw upon personal or professional knowledge. It is expected that MRWG member knowledge will accent the data in the tool.

Craig Fusaro — Should we begin with initial weighting? Otherwise, we will be applying different data in different ways.

The group agreed to begin with three weighting profiles for the biodiversity and socioeconomic goals (i.e. 50/50, 75/25 and 25/75).

Once the small groups had viewed these weighting profiles they proceeded to explore a variety of ways of generating reserve options with the decision support tool.

## **MRWG BREAKOUT INTO MIXED GROUPS**

Working with Sanctuary, Special Project and Coastal Service Center staff, the breakout groups crafted reserve options with the decision support tool. Nine reserve maps with feedback from the MRWG were generated.

## **Public Outreach Subcommittee Report**

Craig Fusaro — Discussed the upcoming town hall meeting and the need to set a date. The Outreach Subcommittee decided on an open forum format that will be hosted by MRWG members, not the agencies. What is needed is a dialogue to get issues and perspective from the public. He suggested that maps and data could be displayed on the walls to generate a question and answer session. Several outreach tools should be employed to advertise the forum, including press releases, Public Service Announcements and print announcements.

## **Breakout Group Presentations**

A representative from each of the mapping breakout groups discussed the reserve map development. MRWG members were invited to share positive and negative attributes for each reserve option developed.

The facilitation team will work to turn around the options and the feedback within a week so the MRWG can take the maps to their constituents and begin working between now and the Oct 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. MRWG members were asked to think about taking home a group message, to refer to constituent outreach guidelines distributed by the facilitators early in the process, and to focus on MRWG positions not individual opinions to demonstrate the give and take occurring in the process. Emphasize that the draft reserve options are not commitments or final decisions. While there may be divergent ideas now, convergence happens in time. [See the nine reserve option maps and accompanying MRWG feedback distributed one week after the meeting].

John Ugoretz noted the following overlaps in the maps -

- 8 out of 9 maps included Gull Island, SCI
- 6 out of 9 Talcot Shoals, SRI
- 8 out of 9 some part of SBI
- 6 out of 9 the Footprint between SCI and ANI
- 9 out of 9 NW SMI

Dale Glantz - Thanked everyone for considering kelp interests.

Neil Guglielmo - Thanked the MRWG for considering squid interests in the mapping exercise.

Tom Raftican — The work accomplished today is a tribute to the Sanctuary and facilitators.

Mike McGinnis — There is a wealth of data and knowledge behind the maps, the decision support tool is good for adding information depth to the maps, and the MRWG now needs to get the community behind the maps.



Craig Fusaro - Found the mapping exercise and outcomes interesting and now needs time to think about the options. Wants to emphasize open minds on no take areas, to consider buffer zones, phasing in, rotating reserves, etc.

Michael Eng - Encourages divergent thinking and new approaches. Don't need to lobby for one reserve option. Public input will be critical.

Patty Wolf - Commended CINMS and NOAA staff and the MRWG for doing great work on a very challenging part of the process. Between now and October it is important to involve the public and constituents.

Matt Pickett - Thanked all the NOAA staff, and believes the MRWG is fortunate to have good data to generate meaningful maps. Today helped validate community process and hopes the Channel Islands Reserves process continues to serve as a good model for working together.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**